

American Republics Unite To Halt Spread of Communism in Western Hemisphere

The Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Serving as Organ of Consultation in Application of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, was held at Punta del Este, Uruguay, January 22-31. The meeting was convoked by a resolution of the Council of the Organization of American States on December 4, 1961, to "consider the threats to the peace and to the political independence of the American states that might arise from the intervention of extracontinental powers directed toward breaking American solidarity."

Following are statements made by Secretary Rusk upon his departure for the meeting and at the sessions of January 25 and 31, together with texts of the nine resolutions adopted on January 31 and explanatory statements by several delegations.

DEPARTURE STATEMENT, JANUARY 20

Press release 45 dated January 20

The Eighth Meeting of Consultation of the American Foreign Ministers, which will begin on Monday in Punta del Este, Uruguay, is of paramount importance to the Organization of American States, in fact to the entire inter-American system.

Meeting at the request of the Government of Colombia, the ministers will be seeking agreement on measures appropriate to the present situation; that is, one in which Cuba, a member government of the Organization of American States, has made itself an accomplice to the Communist conspiracy dedicated to the overthrow of the representative governments of the hemisphere.

I am confident that the foreign ministers, recognizing the danger which this situation presents to our free societies and the collective security of the hemisphere, will find within the inter-American system the most effective possible means for the protection and strengthening of the principles upon which this system was founded.

STATEMENT OF JANUARY 25

Press release 55 dated January 25

It is a very great personal pleasure for me to be here for my first meeting with my colleagues

of the Americas. The fact that I find among them a number of old friends enhances that pleasure.

I join my colleagues in expressing our deep appreciation to the Government of Uruguay for the warm hospitality which we are enjoying in this lovely place and for all the arrangements which were made on relatively short notice to make this meeting possible. Secretary of State Stettinius once said that there might not have been a Charter of the United Nations had it not been for the weather and charm of San Francisco. I am confident that Punta del Este is making its own special contribution to the unity, strength, and progress of the inter-American system.

For the second time in 6 months the nations of the Americas meet here in pursuit of their common goal—social progress and economic growth within a community of free and independent nations. But this time we come to take measures to safeguard that freedom and independence so that in the future we may devote all our efforts to social progress and economic growth.

We are assembled again on the eastern shore of a vast continent. Across this continent millions of our people are struggling to throw off the bonds of hunger, poverty, and ignorance—to affirm the hope of a better life for themselves and their children. Last August we joined in a historic document, the Charter of Punta del Este, setting forth the goals, the machinery, and the commitments

Department of State Bulletin

necessary to transform that hope into reality. Last August we joined hands in a great alliance—the *Alianza para el Progreso*.¹

Since that time in every part of the hemisphere we have moved forward with fresh energy in fulfillment of the pledges we solemnly undertook to the people of the Americas. The task ahead is vast. Everyone in this hall knows the mighty effort which will be required to break the ancient cycle of stagnation and despair. But the need for action is urgent. Across the world the winds of change are blowing; awakening peoples are demanding to be admitted to the promise of the 20th century. For Americans, north and south, this is a historical challenge. As the 19th century saw the Western Hemisphere enter the epoch of political independence, so the 20th century—if those of us in this room, and the governments we represent, have boldness and faith—will see this hemisphere enter the epoch of economic abundance.

Task of Development Measured in Years

The means by which we seek our ends are the intelligence, decision, and will of the governments and people of the hemisphere. We cannot hope to make progress unless the governments of our nations faithfully meet the needs of their peoples for education and opportunity, unless we press steadily forward with the measures of self-help and social reform which make development possible and spread its benefits among all the people. This work has already begun. Let me say that it is unfinished business in the United States itself. Many Latin American nations are engaged in national plans and programs, internal reforms and action to build houses, schools and factories, roads and dams. My own country has already made large commitments for this fiscal year and will have no difficulty in meeting the more than \$1 billion pledged to the first year of the Alliance for Progress. We have together established international machinery to stimulate and review national plans.

This is a notable beginning. There is, of course, much more to be done. Our task is to be measured, not in the months of this year, but in the years of this decade. I wish there were some way in which we could transmit to you the depth of our affectionate interest in the economic and social pros-

pects of this hemisphere. Perhaps you would forgive me for a personal recollection. Like millions of present-day North Americans, I spent my earliest years in what people would now call underdeveloped circumstances. We were prescientific and pretechnical; we were without public health or medical care; typhoid, pellagra, hookworm, and malaria were a part of the environment in which providence had placed us. Our schools were primitive. Our fathers and mothers earned a meager living with backbreaking toil.

But the great adventure through which many of us have lived has seen the transformation of our lives in a short period—a transformation brought about by the magical combination of education, health, and increasing productivity. On our farms we felt the impact of the indispensable partnership among education, scientific research, and the extension of knowledge to those who could put it to practical use. Neighbor helped neighbor to build a house, a barn, or to pass along news about new prospects and new methods. They joined together to build roads until public funds could take over the burden. They pooled their limited resources to hire a schoolteacher or a doctor. Bits of capital began to accumulate, and this was reinvested in growth and development. More and more young people managed to get to the university, and more and more of these brought their learning back to the benefit of their own people.

These changes did not take place without struggle. Years of thought and work and debate were required to prepare America for the necessary steps of self-help and social reform. I remember well the bitter resistance before Franklin Roosevelt was able to win support for the Tennessee Valley Authority, that immense network of dams and power stations and fertilizer factories and agricultural extension offices which has wrought such miraculous changes in our South. But a succession of progressive leaders, determined to bring about social change within a framework of political consent, carried through an "alliance for progress" within the United States.

Other parts of the hemisphere have experienced similar improvements. What has been done for some must now be done for all. It shall be our common purpose to labor without cease to advance the cause of economic progress and social justice within the hemisphere—to advance the autonomous and peaceful revolution of the Americas.

¹ BULLETIN of Sept. 11, 1961, p. 459.

Choosing the Road Into the Future

There are those in every land who resist change—who see the society they know as the climax of history, who identify their own status and privilege with the welfare of their people, and who oppose the vital land and tax reforms necessary for the completion of our work. But their resistance is doomed to failure. The 19th century is over; and, in the 20th, people across the earth are awakening from centuries of poverty and oppression to claim the right to live in the modern world. "The veil has been torn asunder," wrote Bolívar. "We have seen the light; and we will not be thrust back into the darkness." No one can hope to prolong the past in a revolutionary age. The only question is which road we mean to take into the future.

This is not a question alone for this hemisphere. It is a question faced everywhere in the world. On the one hand are those who believe in change through persuasion and consent—through means which respect the individual. On the other are those who advocate change through the subjugation of the individual and who see in the turbulence of change the opportunity for power.

I do not believe that I have to argue the moral superiority of free society anywhere in the Americas. I do not think, other things being equal, that any rational person would prefer tyranny to tolerance or dictatorship to democracy. But there are some who doubt the capacity of freedom to do the job, and turn in resentment and desperation to totalitarian solutions. They are wrong. History shows that freedom is the most reliable means to economic development and social justice and that communism betrays in performance the ends which it proclaims in propaganda. The humane and pragmatic methods of free men are not merely the right way, morally, to develop an underdeveloped country; they are technically the efficient way.

Failure of Communism To Meet Needs of People

We meet here at Punta del Este to consider the tragedy of Cuba. There have been many elements in that tragedy. One was the failure of the dictatorship which preceded Castro to concern itself with the elementary needs of a people who had a right to be free. Another was the disillusionment of the hopes which rode with Castro at the beginning of his resistance movement. And now

we see the Cuban people subjected to a regime which has committed itself to Marxist-Leninist doctrines at the very time when this answer to economic and social problems has proved itself to be brutal, reactionary, and sterile.

If there is one lesson which we in the Americas can learn from observing what is happening from East Germany to North Viet-Nam, it is that Castroism is not the answer to economic and social development. If there is tension in Berlin today, it is because of the failure of the regime in East Germany and the flight of tens of thousands of its people toward freedom and expanding opportunity. It is worth noting that vast areas of the world with remarkable natural resources have failed to provide even the elementary needs of food, contrasted with the surpluses which abound throughout much of the free world. The needs of the individual have been ruthlessly subjected to the requirements of the power-hungry apparatus of the state. What we know in the free world as the consumer is brushed aside, and men are called upon to submit themselves to the requirements of ambition and appetite.

Wherever communism goes, hunger follows. Communist China today is in the grip of a vast and terrible famine, which, in turn, has led to stagnation and decline of industry. There is hunger in North Viet-Nam. Whatever contribution communism has appeared to make to industrial development comes only because it does what Marx charged 19th-century capitalism with doing, that is, it grinds down the faces of the poor and forces from their postponed consumption the capital necessary for arms and industry. Communism—once in power—has turned out to be the most effective and brutal means known to history for exploiting the working class.

Recognizing its failure in the underdeveloped world, recognizing that its greatest enemy is the process of peaceful and democratic development, communism in recent years has concentrated—in Asia, in Africa, in the Middle East, now in our own hemisphere—on using the troubles of transition to install Communist minorities in permanent power. The techniques by which communism seeks to subvert the development process are neither mysterious nor magical. Khrushchev, Mao Tse-tung, and "Che" Guevara have outlined them in frankness and detail. They seek first to lay the political basis for the seizure of power by winning

converts in sections of the populations whose hopes and ambitions are thwarted by the existing order. They then try to capture control of broadly based popular movements aimed ostensibly at redressing social and economic injustice. In some cases they resort to guerrilla warfare as a means of intimidating opposition and disrupting orderly social progress. At every point the Communists are prepared to invoke all the resources of propaganda and subversion, of manipulation and violence, to maximize confusion, destroy faith in the democratic instrumentalities of change, and open up the way for a Communist takeover.

As for its claim to social justice, Chairman Khrushchev himself has given the most eloquent testimony of the inevitability of monstrous injustice in a system of totalitarian dictatorship. The crimes of Stalin—crimes fully acknowledged by his successor—are the inescapable result of a political order founded on the supposed infallibility of a single creed, a single party, and a single leader. Under the banner of the classless society, communism has become the means of establishing what the Yugoslav Communist Milovan Djilas has termed the “new class”—an elite as ruthless in its determination to maintain its prerogatives as any oligarchy known to history.

Nothing shows more clearly the failure of communism to bring about economic development and social justice than the present condition of Europe. The bankruptcy of communism is etched in the contrast between the thriving economies of Western Europe and the drab stagnation of Eastern Europe—and it is symbolized in the wall of Berlin, erected to stop the mass flight of ordinary people from communism to freedom.

The proponents of free society need have no apologies. We have moved far beyond the rigid *laissez faire* capitalism of the 19th century. The open society of the mid-20th century can offer the reality of what the Communists promise but do not and cannot produce, because the means they are using, the techniques of hatred and violence, can never produce anything but more violence and more hatred. Communism is not the wave of the future. Communists are only the exploiters of people's aspirations—and their despair. They are the scavengers of the transition from stagnation into the modern world. The wave of the future is the peaceful, democratic revolution symbolized for the Americas in the Alliance for Progress—the revolution which will bring change without chaos,

development without dictatorship, and hope without hatred.

This is our faith. Because we have pledged ourselves to this road into the future, we have no more urgent obligation than to guarantee and protect the independence of the democratic revolution. Because communism has its own ambitions, communism everywhere directs its most intense effort to making democratic change impossible. It is in this setting that I ask you to consider the question of the purposes and methods of communism in our hemisphere.

Cuba's Defection From Inter-American System

If the one striking development of the last years in our hemisphere has been the rise of the Alliance for Progress, the other striking development has been the defection of Cuba from the inter-American system.

Let us be clear about the character of the problem presented by Castro and his government. We have no quarrel with the people of Cuba. As this week we have welcomed a free Dominican Republic back into the inter-American community, so we look forward to the day when a free and progressive government will flourish in Habana and the Cuban people can join with us in the common undertakings of the hemisphere.

Many of us in this hemisphere had no quarrel with the avowed purposes of the revolution of 1959. Many rejoiced in the aspirations of the Cuban people for political liberty and social progress. Nor would we have any quarrel with changes in the economic organization of Cuba instituted with the consent of the Cuban people. Our hemisphere has room for a diversity of economic systems. But we do condemn the internal excesses of the Castro regime—the violations of civil justice, the drumhead executions, the suppression of political, intellectual, and religious freedom. But even these things, repellent as they are, have been known to our continent. If kept within the confines of one unhappy country, they would not constitute a direct threat to the peace and the independence of other American states. What we cannot accept—and will never accept—is the use of Cuba as the means through which extracontinental powers seek to break up the inter-American system, to overthrow the governments of other countries, and to destroy the autonomous democratic evolution of the hemisphere.

The Castro regime has extended the global battle to Latin America. It has supplied communism with a bridgehead in the Americas, and it has thereby brought the entire hemisphere into the frontline of the struggle between communism and democracy. It has turned itself into an arsenal for arms and ammunition from the Communist world. With Communist help Dr. Castro has built up the largest military establishment in Latin America.

Within the United Nations the Cuban delegation has abandoned its brethren of the hemisphere to play the smirking sycophant for the Communist bloc. Out of the 37 rollcall votes taken on the most important issues in the last session of the General Assembly, a majority of the members of the Organization of American States voted together 35 times. But, of these 37 votes, Cuba voted 33 times with the Soviet bloc and only 5 times with the OAS majority. Cuba opposed the resolution appealing to the Soviet Union not to explode the 50-megaton bomb; it was the only delegation in the United Nations, besides the 10 avowed members of the Soviet bloc, to do so. In the same manner Cuba alone joined the Communist bloc to oppose the resolution calling for a nuclear test ban treaty with international controls. On several occasions Cuban representatives followed other members of the Communist bloc in walking out of the General Assembly when delegates of states not approved by the Soviet Union dared take the floor.

Previous OAS Actions Against Communism

At the seventh meeting of foreign ministers at San José in August 1960, our governments together rejected any attempt on the part of the Communist powers to exploit the political, economic, or social troubles of any American state.² Since San José the Cuban government has aligned itself more flagrantly than ever with those dedicated to the overthrow of the inter-American system and the destruction of inter-American freedom. The Soviet-Cuban communique of September 20, 1961, and the Chinese-Cuban communique of October 2, 1961, both signed by President [Osvaldo] Dorticós, proclaim an identity of views on foreign policy between the Cuban and the Soviet and Chinese Communist regimes. Only a few weeks ago Dr. [Raúl] Roa, the Cuban Minister

of Foreign Affairs, made clear once again that the primary allegiance of the Castro government is not to its brethren in the Americas but to its comrades beyond the Iron Curtain. "The socialist camp, led by the invincible Soviet Union, is with the Cuban revolution," Dr. Roa said. "We are neither alone nor helpless. The world is with the Cuban revolution, and the future belongs entirely to the universal socialist society that is coming, and of which, forever, Cuba already forms part."

When Dr. Castro himself said on December 2, "I am a Marxist-Leninist and I shall be a Marxist-Leninist until the last day of my life," he could have surprised only those who have paid no attention to the evolution of the Castro regime. This public oath of fealty to Marxism-Leninism underlines Dr. Castro's commitment to the Leninist use of deception and violence, to the Leninist contempt for free institutions, and to the Leninist injunction that obedience to the international Communist movement is the highest duty.

Driven by this Marxist-Leninist faith, the Castro regime has dedicated itself, not to the struggle for democracy within the hemisphere or even within Cuba, but to the perversion and corruption of this struggle in the interests of world communism. Part III of the report of the Inter-American Peace Committee sets forth the ties of the government of Cuba with the Sino-Soviet bloc, its subversive activities within the hemisphere, its violations of human rights, and the incompatibility of its behavior with the Charter of the Organization of American States.

Fourteen years ago at Bogotá the Ninth International Conference of American States in its Resolution XXXII on "The Preservation and Defense of Democracy in America" declared that "by its anti-democratic nature and its interventionist tendency, the political activity of international communism or any other totalitarian doctrine is incompatible with the concept of American freedom." This resolution condemned "interference by any foreign power, or by any political organization serving the interests of a foreign power, in the public life of the nations of the American continent." The American Republics solemnly resolved "to adopt, within their respective territories and in accordance with their respective constitutional provisions, the measures necessary to eradicate and prevent activities directed, assisted or instigated by foreign governments, organizations or individuals tending to

² *Ibid.*, Sept. 12, 1960, p. 395.

overthrow their institutions by violence, to foment disorder in their domestic political life, or to disturb, by means of pressure, subversive propaganda, threats or by any other means, the free and sovereign right of their peoples to govern themselves in accordance with their democratic aspirations."

Three years ago at Santiago the foreign ministers of the American Republics reaffirmed the Bogotá resolution in the Declaration of Santiago,^{*} condemning "the methods of every system tending to suppress political and civil rights and liberties, and in particular the action of international communism or any other totalitarian doctrine."

No one can doubt, on the basis of hard evidence compiled by committees of the OAS and known to every observer in our hemisphere, that the Castro regime has placed itself in a position of systematic and contemptuous hostility to these principles of our inter-American system. Beyond the evidence every delegate in this hall knows in his mind and heart that those behind Castro hope to overthrow his government and every other government in Latin America. The Castro regime, by repudiating the principles and philosophy of the inter-American system and making itself the American agent of world communism, has created a clear and present danger to the prospects of free and democratic change in every country in Latin America. The time has come for the American Republics to unite against Communist intervention in this hemisphere. We believe in the inter-American system. We stand on the principles of the Charter of the Organization of American States. We are faithful to the ancient hope of a hemisphere of free democracies, bound together in independence and common purpose. Else we would reject that hope, forsake our faith itself, exposed in its isolation to every gust of political or ideological fanaticism.

The Alliance for Progress is the best way of attacking the longrun sources of the Communist appeal—poverty, hunger, and ignorance. But the Alliance cannot by itself provide a means of warding off the shortrun Communist tactics of disruption and subversion. Vitamin tablets will not save a man set upon by hoodlums in an alley. If the Alliance is to succeed, we need to protect the democratic processes of change; we need a shield behind which constructive measures can

take effect in steady and secure progression. We have seen the effect of Communist disruptive tactics in other lands and other continents. Let us take action now to guard our own continent and our programs of democratic reform against those who seek to replace democracy by dictatorship, those who would transform our fellowship of free states into a bondage of satellites.

I am confident that this meeting of foreign ministers will hearten the democratic forces of this continent by making it clear that we will not stand still while the enemies of democracy conspire to make democratic change impossible. Against Dr. Castro's Communist allies let us reaffirm our faith in our own good neighbors; let us commit our minds and our hearts to the success of our free Alliance for Progress.

Four Major Actions To Take Against Castro

What is our working task here at this meeting? I suggest we must move in four major directions:

First, we must recognize that the alignment of the government of Cuba with the countries of the Sino-Soviet bloc, and its commitment to extend Communist power in this hemisphere, are incompatible with the purposes and principles of the inter-American system and that its current activities are an ever-present and common danger to the peace and security of the continent.

Second, we must now make the policy decision to exclude the Castro regime from participation in the organs and bodies of the inter-American system and to direct the Council of the Organization to determine how best to give rapid implementation to this decision. Within our own competence, since the Inter-American Defense Board was created by a meeting of consultation, we can and should now exclude the government of Cuba from membership in the Inter-American Defense Board. This step would correct at once the most obvious incongruity arising from the participation of a regime allied with the Sino-Soviet bloc in a body planning the defense of the hemisphere against the aggressive designs of international communism.

Third, we must interrupt the limited but significant flow of trade between Cuba and the rest of the hemisphere, especially the traffic in arms.

Fourth, we must set in motion a series of individual and communal acts of defense against the various forms of political and indirect aggression

^{*} For text, see *ibid.*, Sept. 7, 1959, p. 342.

mounted against the hemisphere. The acts of political aggression which the Castro regime is committing have an immediate and direct impact in the general Caribbean area near the focus of infection. Yet with one exception there is not a foreign minister present whose country has not felt the impact of the interventionist activities which constitute essential elements of the international Communist design. We must find adequate means to strengthen our capacity to anticipate and overcome this constant gnawing at the security of our peoples. In particular we should direct the Inter-American Defense Board to establish a special security committee to recommend individual and collective measures to the governments of the American states for their greater protection against any acts or threats of aggression, direct or indirect, resulting from the continued intervention of Sino-Soviet powers or others associated with them.

A Few Basic Facts To Consider

As we confront these decisions let us face, as old friends and neighbors, a few basic facts in our situation. The weight of Communist aggressive techniques is felt unequally among us; the nature of the Communist threat is understood in different ways among our peoples; and the OAS itself is confronted, as a body, with a form of aggressive action relatively new in its history.

We have heard references to the intrusion of the cold war into this hemisphere. There may be some who wonder whether the Americas are being caught up, as innocent bystanders, in a struggle among the giants.

But let us think clearly about what the cold war is and what it is not. The Communist world has dedicated itself to the indefinite expansion of what it calls its historically inevitable world revolution. The cold war is simply the effort of communism to extend its power beyond the confines of the Communist bloc and the effort of free men to defend themselves against this systematic aggression. The cold war would have been unknown to us had the Soviet Union determined, at the end of World War II, to live in peace with other nations in accordance with its commitments under the Charter of the United Nations. The cold war would end tomorrow if those who control the Communist movement would cease their aggressive acts, in all their many forms. Nothing would be more grati-

fying to the citizens of my country than to have the Soviet Union bring about the revolution of peace by a simple decision to leave the rest of the world alone.

But the cold war is not a contest between the Soviet Union and the United States which the United States is pursuing for national ends. It is a struggle in the long story of freedom between those who would destroy it and those who are determined to preserve it. If every nation were genuinely independent, and left alone to work out its relations with its neighbors by common agreement, the tensions between Washington and Moscow would vanish overnight.

Speaking last October before the 22d Communist Party Congress, Mr. Khrushchev said: "We firmly believe that the time will come when the children and grandchildren of those who do not understand and do not accept communism will live under communism."

This is his belief. Were it only his belief we need not care; but it is also the program of action of the Communist powers—and about that we care a very great deal.

We know that the Communist effort to impose their system on other nations and peoples will fail and that the next generation will dwell in a community of independent nations, each freely pursuing the welfare of its people. We know this is so because history confirms that freedom must win because it is rooted in the nature of man and in his relations with God.

Our problem today is to combine a sense of the necessities of the harsh realities with the dreams upon which civilized man has steadily built. A shining future is waiting for us in this hemisphere—a future in which every child will have a decent chance for life, for education, for medical care, for constructive labor and creative contribution; in which every Republic on this continent will cooperate to improve lagging standards, to elevate culture, and to raise man to his full dignity in freedom.

We have the talents, the resources, and the aspirations. We need not retreat into the murky shadows of a conspiratorial society developed on the steppes of central Asia, because we can move ahead in the great tradition of a civilization which was born in the free discourse of the early Mediterranean world more than 2,000 years ago, was nourished in Western Europe, and came to this

hemisphere to be extended by Bolívar and San Martín, by Martí, Jefferson, and Lincoln.

Our task today is not to let a petty tyrant who has appeared among us divert us from these great tasks but to put him in his place while we proceed with the great adventure upon which we are embarked together.